

7956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 15

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can approach these questions that we are currently debating on a partisan basis, but I do think there are certain unanswered questions which should be discussed. We are all amazed by the fact that apparently nobody was apprised of the dangerous situation existing in South America when the Vice President went there. This debate originated this afternoon by virtue of a question asked whether or not the State Department should have known this or whether the statement made by an employee of the State Department to the effect that they did not have enough employees to find this out. This fact is crystal clear, however, regardless of whether anybody employed by the United States Government in South America should have known about it, the fact does remain that the local governments involved failed miserably to give adequate protection to a high official of this Government. I do not know whether we have had any apologies from those governments or not, but I know one thing: If this had happened during the Teddy Roosevelt days, he would have sent the old battleship in again like he did in South America before, and he would have demanded an apology instant.

I am glad the President took the action he did. I am not criticizing the President; I am glad he took the action he did to send troops immediately into the area.

But the main thing I got on my feet to say is that although we are appropriating unbelievably large sums for the Central Intelligence Agency, we are not getting from this agency the kind of information we are entitled to have for the money we spend.

I want to inquire of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]—I would direct this question to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] if I could see him at the moment—but I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York how many Members of the House of Representatives know the total amount we appropriate for the CIA?

Mr. TABER. I think five.

Mr. PRESTON. Five Members. I thank the gentleman.

If we were getting real results from this agency we might put up with the luxury of the hoodwinking and the blindfolding of Members of the House as to this Agency, but we are not getting it, so I think it is time we turned the light on them and found out how many employees they have, where they are operating, how many in Peru, how many in Venezuela, what they are doing, how much money they have.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, there never has been a single instance where they failed to produce information and lay it before the proper officers of the Government as to the facts on any of these things that have come on. I have checked that very carefully.

Mr. PRESTON. Before whom did they lay the information about the insults that were going to be hurled at Vice President Nixon?

Mr. TABER. They laid the whole information with reference to the people

down in South America before the State Department before he left.

Mr. PRESTON. Then if we permitted the Vice President to go into those countries with that information known we risked his very life.

Mr. TABER. Would not the gentleman like to try to straighten out any feeling there really was down in South America?

Mr. PRESTON. If that information was laid before our people and our State Department did not call on the local governments to provide adequate security for the Vice President, they are possibly guilty of criminal negligence.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The gentleman from New York stated that they laid information before the proper authorities; but I question the accuracy of that information, and I wonder where they bought it, because they do not seem to have qualified men in intelligence to come up with correct information. You cannot evaluate faulty information and arrive at any useful results.

I think it is about time there was a complete investigation by Congress of our intelligence agencies responsible for this faulty information—or intelligence if you use a misnomer—that comes from CIA. There is abundant evidence that our top officials are receiving faulty information with respect to critical issues around the world which causes us to make blunders which reduce our prestige in the world. This is the case not only in the present situation in South and Central America, but also in Korea and other places which resulted in the loss of the lives of many of our soldiers.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct. We have been late in discovering any action Russia intended.

Every American has been insulted by these countries of South America. The flag of our country has been desecrated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(On request of Mr. Boggs, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Preston was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. JUDD. It is a little hard to put it in the form of a question. Does not the gentleman agree that the Communists have trained cadres, ready to start riots, or strikes, or other disrupting operations whenever the signal comes, whenever the order is given, in every country of the world, including the United States of America and especially among youth groups? Does not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. PRESTON. I am not on the inside; I could not answer with great truth, but I suspect it.

Mr. JUDD. You can be sure of it. They exist. But how is it possible for anybody to know just when the men in the Kremlin will decide to issue the order

to go into action in a particular country or area where they have the trained people whom they have been preparing for just such events for years ahead of time.

Mr. PRESTON. My dear doctor, you are not the naive man that you would appear to be. The gentleman knows that the FBI has successfully infiltrated every Communist cell in this country. Why, then, is it impossible to penetrate cells in other countries, these youth groups, when we have unlimited funds for use by our CIA agents all over the world? Why have we not penetrated these organizations? Failure to do so indicates incompetence, in my opinion.

Mr. JUDD. I think we have penetrated many of them. But we cannot know ahead of time when the order will be given. Does not the gentleman think it is unfortunate that more countries do not have institutions like the House Committee on Un-American Activities which, despite all the abuse it has received, has nevertheless stuck to its vitally important business of focusing public attention on, and thereby keeping us more alert to the skillful infiltration of the Communists?

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think it is a very sad commentary that it appears that none of the major upheavals of recent years have been known to the American Government and the American people until we read it in the papers, despite the fact that we are spending several million dollars a year on this agency whose accounts apparently are scanned little, if any, by anybody in the representative branches of the Government. I think the gentleman is making a distinct contribution by focusing attention on this matter as he has.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman from New York said there are about 5 people in the Congress who knew the amount provided for the CIA. Can the gentleman tell me of one person in the Congress who knows whether they have come up with any information that has been any good or not?

Mr. PRESTON. That is difficult to answer. I have raised this question before. The CIA has invited me to come down and have a briefing, and I fully expect to go at the first opportunity. I do not know how much they will tell me when I go, but I have certain questions I propose to ask. I do not want to violate any security rules or any security regulations, and I am not asking anybody here to violate them on the floor of the House as to how much we appropriate. But, through the grapevine around here I found out, and I was shocked at the amount of money they have spent.

1958

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7957

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I speak only as a layman because I have no information other than what I read in the newspapers, and obviously just five Members of Congress have information on this subject, but reading the press as best I could, I gathered that we had no advance information about what happened in Suez a year or so ago. In addition to that, when Russia launched its sputnik last October and then launched another one—and they launched another one yesterday which weighs about a ton—it came as a great surprise to the American people. Now, did you as a member of the Committee on Appropriations have any knowledge about either Suez or about the development of outer space satellites?

Mr. PRESTON. Of course we did not, and I do not recall ever having gotten any direct information from the CIA except on one subject, and that was the dissemination of Russian scientific papers that we wanted to translate in the Commerce Department.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I am pleased to hear the gentleman say that he is going down to have a briefing with CIA. In the Committee on Armed Services, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], it is part of our business to investigate what the CIA does in military matters. I hope you will talk to him likewise and know that we are occasionally brought up to date on the activities of the CIA. And, of course, while they have faults, they have done some commendable things due to the knowledge they have brought to the proper people at the right time. And, I am very glad that you are going down and listen to what they say.

Mr. PRESTON. The Members of Congress generally have the impression that we do not get much information from them.

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are getting into rather small space when we are discussing on the floor of the House the question of what the Vice President of the United States ought to have done under circumstances which we know very little about. In many instances on these good-will trips he is faced with circumstances beyond his control and it is necessary for him to make on-the-spot decisions.

Let me give you an example. Five years ago this fall when he was in India on his good-will mission, I was there at the same time. One afternoon in Rangoon, Burma, he visited a religious temple in one part of the city. When he got out of his car he, for the first time, saw that it was necessary for him to walk about one-half mile down a long avenue. This avenue was lined with

Communist demonstrators of all types—some with signs advising him to go home.

At that moment he had to make a decision whether to walk openly down this avenue or to retreat into his automobile and drive away defeated. He was advised by members of the State Department that his life was in danger if he chose to take the walk. As the Vice President has said on several occasions since then, he had to make up his mind as to whether or not he was going to stand up for our country and proceed in accordance with what he felt was made necessary by the dignity of his office.

He walked down that street to the temple. Fortunately for everyone no incident took place.

Now I presume that when he went to South America he was similarly advised of the calculated risks which he had to take. He was faced with the same kind of decisions in every country which he visited. Those calculated risks are a part of his job and I doubt if any of us would feel very proud of him if he chose to retreat from what he felt was right and in the best interests of his mission in that country—even though it involved considerable personal risk.

These are just a part of the problems that the Vice President faces anywhere he goes in the world. I think we should feel proud of the Vice President and his wife that they chose to proceed with their mission even though the risks were great.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to talk for a moment about the entire problem of South America.

I think everyone here knows that I have been a strong supporter of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. No one in this chamber has exceeded me in his admiration of Cordell Hull, who I think was one of our great Secretaries of State and I have said that on this floor before. In addition I have voted for mutual assistance, mutual security, and foreign aid each year it has been before this Congress.

However, in South America a substantial part of the basis of our commercial relationship grew out of World War II. During those 4 years we absorbed an abnormally large amount of minerals and raw materials of all kinds from South America. This continued for several years after World War II.

In the last 4 or 5 years we have arrived at a time in our economy when we are not able to absorb as much of these raw materials as we did in wartime. We have had to cut back. We are absorbing far less. The problem in no way resembles that which faced Cordell Hull in 1936 when the Mutual Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first enacted. A large foreign export market of South America's raw materials was built up in the United States. This cutback, which has been necessary with the ups and downs of our economy, has created the crises that exist in many of the South American countries. That is the reason many of the South American countries are looking around for other markets than the United States.

The problems in South America, insofar as the export of their raw materials is concerned, considerably resemble the agricultural export problems of this country at the present time. During and for a number of years after World War II we produced a tremendous surplus of agricultural products which were shipped to countries all over the world. During the war years we were feeding a substantial portion of the people of Europe and the Near and Far East. Now many of those markets have returned to normal. We are faced with a surplus problem in agricultural products. In this respect the South American problem resembles our own in the field of agriculture.

We cannot continue to take those raw materials from South America at the same rate at which we did during World War II, when we took everything they had to export. That is the basis of the problem with which we are faced in South America today. There is no easy solution, but I do believe that we are working on it and that something can be worked out which will be satisfactory. As has been pointed out on the floor today we have passed legislation last year to help some of these countries develop portions of their economy which can substitute for the exports which are presently lacking.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, may I say that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act can only partially solve the problem which I have pointed out above, but I do believe the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be extremely helpful in alleviating a portion of the raw-material problem of South America.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these matters because there are changes that we will have to make in our foreign policy. But it is small stuff for us here today to be talking about what the Vice President of the United States should have done 3,000 miles away. He was faced with circumstances where he had to make an immediate decision, even though risk was involved. I do not believe any of us are in a position to say that the decision he made was wrong on the basis of the bare facts which we have been able to obtain thus far.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure no one listening to this debate could conceivably read into it any taint of partisanship. Of course, that is as it should be, because if there is one area which is of vital, of transcendent importance to us today, I believe it is the area immediately to the south of us, in Latin America.

Whether or not the Vice President received warning of what might conceivably transpire in Buenos Aires, in Lima, or in Caracas, I do not know. But I do know that under very similar circumstances in Bogota, Colombia, in April of 1948, when Gen. George Marshall was Secretary of State, the CIA and the other intelligence agencies did come to General Marshall and inform him that there was every likelihood that there

might be rioting and difficulty in Bogota during the Ninth Conference of American States.

Mr. Marshall said:

I do not propose to call off the conference so far as the United States is concerned. I think we have gone to too much work and too much preparation. Those who do not wish to stay who are members of the delegation can go home. However, I propose to stay here and I propose to carry out the items that we have on our agenda.

I am inclined to think that this was probably the case as far as the Vice President is concerned, because it is very naive to believe that there are not well organized cadres of Communists in the Latin American Republics as there are everywhere else including the United States, cadres which are capable of instantaneous action when the opportunity offers itself. It is very difficult, I submit, Mr. Chairman, to know when that order is going to be given because it is the sole responsibility of the principal functionary of the party in any particular area, and I am sure that he is not going to confide his instructions from the higher echelons to the members of the CIA no matter how capable they may happen to be or how well trained they are in intelligence work. This is a single decision.

I think if one works with the Communist conspiracy as does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities here in the House of Representatives that is one fundamental thing that you learn, that you do not sit down and discuss whether or not you are going to revolt, you do not discuss whether you are going to riot or sabotage or conduct espionage. You are told when the decision is made by the one individual who has the authority to make that decision.

So I think that if there is any misunderstanding of this point or if there is any widespread belief in this House that the revolutionaries stand around on the street corners discussing what they are going to do, it might be well to disabuse our minds internationally and nationally on that point. This is a subtle, well organized, well directed, dedicated movement, and it is very difficult indeed to determine in advance what they are going to do.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when I heard the story referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] of the Vice President's dangerous walk in Burma, I thought there should be put into the permanent record and given to the House the sequel of that story.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with which I was traveling landed in Burma just a few days after that incident. I sat at luncheon near a prominent member of the Government of Burma. He said to me, "That is quite a Vice President you have." I looked at him and said, "Well, I think so. What gives occasion to that remark?" He said, "You know, I was out with him when he took that walk through the hostile Communist crowd the other day, and when I came back that night

I sat down in my club in Rangoon next to the Communist who had planned the whole thing, and that man said to me, 'Were you out today with the Vice President?' I said, 'Yes; I was.' The Communist leader said, 'Well, we lost that round.'"

I am inclined to think, Mr. Chairman, that when a young American carrying heavy responsibilities and carrying also with him the dignity of his own country walks proudly forth and takes the risk, he will indeed win plenty of rounds against communism.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors (including meals and lodging for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of the act of June 6, 1900, 31 Stat. 362); compensation of jury commissioners; and fees of United States commissioners and other committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States Code, section 3041; \$4,925,000.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROONEY], with a view to getting some background information. I notice on page 18 of the report in the comparative statement of appropriations for 1958 there is shown a payment to the Republic of Panama of \$1,930,000. I fail to find out where this is covered specifically, in what part of the appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that the committee does not have a single thing to do with this. This is a permanent appropriation which is directed by law to be paid to the Republic of Panama. There is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Does not the Department of State come to you and ask for the money, since it is up to the Congress to appropriate all moneys given to the agencies?

Mr. ROONEY. No; they do not have to come to us and ask for the money.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring that to the attention of the Congress from this standpoint. In 1955 we signed a treaty with the Republic of Panama upping the so-called gratuity payment from \$430,000 to \$1,930,000—an increase of \$1,500,000. Prior to this time in the previous treaties covering this gratuity, payment was made by the Department of State indirectly to the Panama Canal Company which passed on the \$430,000 to the shippers by way of tolls. In the 1955 treaty, our Government agreed to raise this by \$1,500,000. There is a question in my mind and in the minds of many Members of the Congress as to whether or not this additional \$1,500,000 should be repaid to our taxpayers by charging tolls to the users of the Panama Canal. The precedent was set in the original treaty with Panama. The precedent for charging this money to the tolls was set in the 1935 treaty and should have been continued in the 1955 treaty.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. My recollection is, and I think the gentleman if he checks will find, that under the treaty itself there is a provision that these payments shall not come out of tolls. It is something over which the Congress, or at least the House of Representatives, would have no control. My recollection is that the treaty itself provides that payment shall be made, but not out of tolls from the canal.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is not my recollection of the treaty because we considered this last year in the Congress along with other problems about this treaty, conveying to the Republic of Panama land and property with a market value of \$24 million. We considered that bill up here in the House under suspension of the rules. When it went to conference with the Members of the other body, it was agreed then that this amount of money would be considered by this Congress this year although no action has been taken.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee of the Whole, annual payments are made to the Government of Panama in consideration of rights granted in perpetuity for the construction of the Panama Canal. A new treaty of mutual understanding and cooperation entered into force on August 23, 1954, provided for an annual payment by the United States of \$1,930,000 of which \$430,000 is reimbursed to the United States Treasury by the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The question I raise is why does not the Congress get busy and also charge the \$1,500,000 because under the treaties operating at the present time two-thirds of the people using the Panama Canal are foreign-flag ships and it amounts to a situation where we are subsidizing these foreign-flag ships.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to my distinguished friend that he is in the wrong store. This committee is not in the business of making treaties.

Mr. SHEEHAN. No; but we are in the business of implementing treaties by making appropriations for them.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied the hearings on this bill as well as the hearings from past years and there are several questions which have arisen in my mind about the operation of the State Department's Historical Division. I know the Appropriations Committee has been furnished considerable information on this question. However, from the printed record, it appears to me that this function of the State Department shows a consistent record of nonperformance in the publication of the diplomatic papers of past years.

I would like to review some of the record of this Division's activity—Incidentally, an activity which requires a third of a million dollars next year. On page

1958

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7959

812 of the Appropriations Committee hearings for the fiscal year 1955, the Division's spokesmen made firm commitments that the volumes of diplomatic papers for the World War II conferences at Malta-Yalta, the first and second Cairo conferences, and the Teheran meeting would be published in fiscal year 1955. With the exception of the Malta-Yalta volume, the records of these conferences still are not published.

From the hearings on the bill for fiscal 1959, it appear that the records of the Potsdam conference is still in the manuscript stage and those of Cairo and Teheran only in the galley-proof stage. This means, I believe, that the required clearances by individuals and other governments probably has not begun. A logical question is why has this work bogged down—particularly in view of the commitment that the volumes were to have been published 2 years ago?

Comparing the record of what was promised in 1954 and what has been produced, the same line of delay is obvious. Two volumes of the papers of the conferences at Washington, Quebec, and Casablanca were promised for fiscal year 1956. Yet in the hearings 3 years later we see that these volumes are represented as still in the process of being compiled. In other words, they have not yet been put into galleys and have not even started the clearance process. Therefore, the clearance problem cannot be accepted as a valid excuse for the non-performance of the Historical Division.

To go on with the Historical Division's record, in the same hearings for fiscal year 1955, it was promised that in fiscal year 1956, four volumes of diplomatic papers on our relations with China from 1943-46 would be published. These volumes were not published in fiscal year 1956 and there is no indication today when they may appear. The Historical Division in the hearings also promised to publish in fiscal year 1957, three volumes on our relations with China from 1947-49. These have not appeared. The entire China series from 1942 through 1949 was to have been completed in fiscal year 1957. Only the papers for 1942 have seen the light of publication.

I cannot find any mention of the missing volumes of the China series in this year's hearings. They seem to have mysteriously disappeared and the project abandoned. One can only conclude that the diplomatic record of our relations with China has been blacked out. Have the papers been processed to the galley proof stage where clearance could begin? Have foreign governments been asked to clear any of the papers and, if so, have they given their clearances in some instances?

Going back into the hearings, on page 263 of the hearings for fiscal 1958, the Chief of the Historical Division advised the committee, "We have a program which anticipates the publication of 8 volumes this year and 10 volumes in the next fiscal year, or 18 volumes." Instead of 8 volumes in fiscal 1957, it appears 4 were published. In fiscal year 1958, one volume of diplomatic papers was published. Thus, instead of 18 volumes

called for in the justification for funds, 5 were actually published.

I believe the publication cost for each of these volumes is something in excess of \$10,000. Regardless of the valid question of the withholding of information they contain, there is a considerable sum appropriated for the 13 volumes for which the State Department committed itself and which have not appeared.

We read in the hearings this year that the rate of production of the Historical Division is "reasonable" in the opinion of the State Department. If this "reasonable" rate continues at its present pace, we can expect a complete blackout of publication next year. It appears that we will see again this year the reprinting of material already published in the State Department bulletin as a substitute for the diplomatic papers publications program for which these funds are intended.

The Historical Division has fallen very far short of meeting its declared publication schedule. Twenty-eight volumes had been allowed to pile up in the Historical Division up to 1953. This backlog now appears to have grown to about 40 volumes. Two questions arise: Is this a breakdown in the administration of the Division resulting from a failure to obtain clearances for volumes already compiled? If not, is the failure a deliberate or calculated policy of the Department?

Until these questions are answered satisfactorily, I urge that we serve notice on the State Department and make clear that it is the intent of Congress that these records should be published without any more delays or, if such is the case, suppression. Another third of a million dollars for the production of the State Department's Historical Division does not seem justified to me until we can see that the money is being used for what was intended when the sum was approved here.

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HENDERSON), is accusing the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and the top officials of the State Department of a conspiracy in refusing to bring to the surface certain facts with regard to these treaties? They have had full and exclusive control of this program for the past 5 years. They have been given every dollar they have asked of the Congress for the publication of these volumes. Is that the point the gentleman is trying to make?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am pointing to the fact that there has been none published, and that is not due to the fact that we have not appropriated funds.

Mr. ROONEY. Cannot the Congress trust the Secretary of State and the top officials of the State Department to carry out their work in this regard, and not cover up for anyone?

Mr. HENDERSON. It is also the right of the Congress to see that funds are

properly used and to investigate their work before allotting additional funds.

Mr. ROONEY. We have had extensive hearings on this subject. As a matter of fact, we had a full investigation by the committee staff a year or so ago. A great many loose statements have been thrown around by a discharged and disgruntled employee who happens to be a hero of a certain midwestern isolationist newspaper. Neither the State Department nor the members of this committee, both majority and minority, believe that there is very much to this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 12428, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 51, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—319

Adair	Baker	Belcher
Addonizio	Baldwin	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Calif.	Baring	Bentley
Allen, Ill.	Barrett	Berry
Anderson,	Bass, N. H.	Betts
H. Carl	Bass, Tenn.	Blatnik
Anfuso	Bates	Boggs
Arends	Baumhart	Boland
Ashley	Beamer	Bolling
Aspinall	Becker	Bolton
Avery	Beckworth	Bosch